

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 624

UD 026 538

AUTHOR Taylor, D. Garth; Lewis, Dan A.
TITLE Educational Reform: Promises and Pitfalls.
Proceedings of a Conference on Urban Education
(Chicago, Illinois, April 8-9, 1988).
INSTITUTION Chicago Urban League, Ill. Dept. of Research.;
Northwestern Univ., Evanston, IL. School of Education
and Social Policy.
PUB DATE 1 Sep 88
NOTE 54p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Change; Administrator Responsibility;
Administrator Role; Budgeting; Community Control;
Curriculum Development; *Decentralization;
*Educational Change; Educational Facilities Design;
Educational Finance; Elementary Schools; Elementary
Secondary Education; Finance Reform; Instructional
Development; Parent Participation; Parent Role;
Parent School Relationship; Principals; *School
Administration; School Based Management; Secondary
Schools; Teacher Responsibility; Teacher Role; *Urban
Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Chicago Public Schools IL; Community Based
Education

ABSTRACT

This report is an overview of a conference on the reform of urban schools, focusing on the Chicago (Illinois) public schools. Panel discussions included the following: (1) "Parents' Role/Parental Involvement"; (2) "School-Based Management"; (3) "The Principal's Roles and Responsibilities"; (4) "Teacher Professionalism: Roles and Responsibilities"; (5) "Curriculum and Instruction for Inner-City Students"; (6) "Community Control Decentralization Models"; (7) "Budgeting and Finance Reform"; and (8) "Central Administration Roles and Responsibilities." Major points of agreement include the following: (1) academic achievement can be indirectly influenced by school organization; (2) central administration has a leadership responsibility for research and design of school organization reform; (3) redesign of school governance and accountability reforms alone are not successful; (4) the Chicago Public Schools are underfinanced when compared to other school districts nationwide. A list of panel moderators and panelists, along with their affiliations, is provided. A 77-item selected bibliography is also included. (FMW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

EDUCATIONAL REFORM: PROMISES AND PITFALLS

Proceedings of a Conference on Urban Education

Prepared by

Chicago Urban League
Research and Planning Department

and

School of Education and Social Policy
Northwestern University
Chicago School Reform Project

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Fox
Chicago Urban League

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

EDUCATIONAL REFORM: PROMISES AND PITFALLS

Proceedings of a Conference on Urban Education

Co-sponsored by CHICAGO URBAN LEAGUE

and NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

in cooperation with

COMMUNITY RENEWAL SOCIETY

April 8 - 9, 1988
Midland Hotel
Chicago, Illinois

Published by:

Chicago Urban League
Research and Planning Department

School of Education and Social Policy
Northwestern University

September 1, 1988

Authors

This report was prepared by Dr. D. Garth Taylor, Director of the Department of Research and Planning of the Chicago Urban League, and Professor Dan A. Lewis from the School of Education and Social Policy of Northwestern University. The results are based on a collaborative effort among the following Northwestern University students who attended the conference and wrote reports about their observations and follow-up research activities:

Fred Harris

Kathy Harris

Michael R. Heise

Maureen L. Jenkins

Tony Maier

Jess McCarthy

Karen McCurdy

Kathy Nakagawa

Jim Palos

Meg Ross

Kathy Tuan

Table of Contents

	page
Authors	
Preface	3
Executive Summary	6
The Conference	
Major Points of Convergence	
Conference Topics and Participants	
Panel 1: Parents' Role/Parental Involvement	11
Panel 2: School-Based Management	17
Panel 3: The Principal's Roles and Responsibilities	20
Panel 4: Teacher Professionalism: Roles and Responsibilities	27
Panel 5: Curriculum and Instruction for Inner-City Students	31
Panel 6: Community Control Decentralization Models	34
Panel 7: Budgeting and Finance Reform	37
Panel 8: Central Administration Roles and Responsibilities	43
Selected Bibliography	47

Preface

A conference, "Education Reform: Promises and Pitfalls," was held on April 8 and 9, 1988 in Chicago. It was co-sponsored by the Chicago Urban League and Northwestern University in cooperation with the Community Renewal Society. Funding was provided by the Spencer Foundation.

The conference was the public unveiling and first public discussion of proposals for school reform put forth by the Chicago Mayor's Summit on Education.

Since its inception in 1986, the Mayor's Summit involved Chicagoans from all walks of life, all ages, races and creeds addressing the critical needs of our educational system. The historical significance of this bold endeavor cannot be underestimated. At the very least, the Summit focused long overdue attention on the crisis in our public schools.

Now, for the first time, many segments of our city's leadership are deeply involved with education. The business community has awakened to the realization that it is dependent upon a skilled and better-educated work force. Our corporate and industry leaders, who understand the nature of investment better than most, have reached the conclusion that we can not afford to continue to divest from the lives of our children. The cost of hiring workers who cannot read, write or count is not good business and it is not good for business. There is also an ever-increasing awareness that failure to provide quality education today leads to greater dependency on tax dollars tomorrow in welfare costs, remediation (when possible), jails, and broken lives.

Equally important is the emergent role of parents and the community at large. Greater -- of course, not total -- responsibility for local school governance will be in the hands of those who, with the exception of students, are most directly affected. This broader input in educational decision-making seems likely to increase public support for and interest in the education process.

At the conference local business, civic, religious and education leaders joined with education experts from around the nation to deliberate on the best path for reform and improvement of public education in Chicago. Resource persons from school systems and educational institutions across the country shared their experiences with the various

plans, ideas, and concepts being debated for educational reform in Chicago. We want to learn from these experiences, to profit from past successes, and to avoid past mistakes.

We will no longer accept a system whose graduates cannot read a menu or complete a job application. The "honorary" high school diploma--one granted because a young person passed time in school, but not because they passed basic reading or math--is beyond our tolerance; a thing of the past.

From past experience, we know that the quick fix is not sufficient to cure the ills of the public schools. We must be prepared for the long haul. Our problems are deeply rooted and complex. Steady and thoughtful progress must be made.

First and foremost, what occurs daily in the classroom must be our highest priority. The Summit proposals and the legislative process since then has moved us toward the understanding that our children--not the Board of Education, not the labor unions, not those in government--and the children's interests must be served if our educational system is to perform its responsibilities. But more needs to be done. Education is essentially a simple process; effective instruction is basically a unique interaction between two individuals--one a teacher, the other a student. It is this interaction that must be at the core of our most dedicated efforts. The true strength of our reform effort will lie in the degree to which we are able to hold teachers accountable for classroom activities. Call it what you may: a classroom is a classroom only when there is teaching and learning. The same holds true for a school.

We must remain committed to making Chicago's public school system an effective partner in building a brighter future for all. The promise made to thousands--that public instruction will be improved--cannot be broken. In a broader sense, it is our absolute responsibility to keep education on the front burner. Our city--and our nation--cannot reach primacy in the technological and scientific revolution without careful attention to the educational needs of its younger members. Untrained minds cannot perform scientific research, unskilled hands cannot perform surgery or man a space shuttle to the outer boundaries of our universe and beyond.

Public education is an American hallmark--a hallmark that has produced a positive impact on our nation's status as a world leader. By further developing educational opportunities for everyone, we will build mindpower that can provide reasonable answers to our international differences.

Renewing the esteem of the cherished institution is long overdue. It is a matter of sound public policy to guarantee our future by focusing our efforts on the vast potential of our youth.

The work to surmount the challenges facing public education in our city is just beginning. The race before us is a marathon, not a sprint. Effective reform requires that we stay the long course of implementation, evaluation and reexamination to the finish. It is our individual and collective hope that the conference and these resulting proceedings will help point the way toward building a brighter future for the Chicago Public Schools.

James W. Compton
President
Chicago Urban League

Dr. Arnold Weber
President
Northwestern University

Dr. Paul H. Sherry
Executive Director
Community Renewal Society

Executive Summary

The Conference

This report is an overview of the proceedings of the conference titled "Education Reform: Promises and Pitfalls" held at the Midland Hotel in Chicago, Illinois, on April 8 and 9, 1988. The conference was co-sponsored by the Chicago Urban League and Northwestern University. Primary funding was provided by the Spencer Foundation, and additional support was provided by the Community Renewal Society.

Major Points of Convergence

Some major points of agreement on education reform policy emerged from the conference. These findings are not uniformly embraced by all conference participants. However, when the comments at the various sessions are held in critical and comparative light, and when follow-up activities are undertaken to determine the factual and/or research basis for positions taken, the following points tend to emerge as the prevailing wisdom on how to achieve realistic and hopeful progress toward school reform.

1. Increased Achievement Through Better School Organization. Enhanced student achievement is a goal that must be pursued indirectly. It is a by-product of better-organized schools. Improvements in school organization that are most likely to impact student achievement involve educational "team-building" with increased opportunities for parental participation.
2. Central Administration Leadership. The central administration of the Chicago Public Schools has a responsibility to provide cutting-edge leadership in research and design of school organization reform. The central administration has a responsibility to design ways to "spin off" and decentralize decision-making processes so that educational teams in schools and classrooms can be built that will allow for more parental participation.
3. Governance/Accountability Reforms Are Not The Key. Redesign of systems for school governance alone holds no promise or expectation for increased educational achievement. Experiments with governance alternatives often take place in the early stages of school system reorganization and increased parental participation. Depending on the model, decentralizing governance structures can actually impede progress toward the collaborative school and classroom teams that are the key to educational progress. Similarly, accountability reforms (based on, for instance, test scores and/or performance

contracts) enacted without organizational improvement hold no promise or expectation for increased educational achievement.

4. The Chicago Public Schools Are Underfinanced. The experience of other school districts across the nation, as well as the research literature, all indicate that until the equity issues in Chicago Public School finance are solved, there will be little hope of increased educational achievement.

These points of agreement do not constitute a "position" on educational reform by the Chicago Urban League, Northwestern University, or any other institution associated with the conference. The statements made by the experts and our follow-up analyses, however, lead to our presentation of the results here as the prevailing wisdom on the wide range of difficult topics that have to be considered in designing school reform alternatives.

Conference Topics and Participants

The conference was organized around eight major issues in school reform. These proceedings are based on:

1. Statements made at the conference by presenters, speakers, and audience members;
2. Follow-up activities we have undertaken to find the documentation for these statements; and
3. Additional efforts we have undertaken to determine the research basis for statements or assertions made by conference participants.

The eight panel topics and expert participants whose statements are summarized in this report are listed below.

Panel 1: Parents' role/parental involvement

Moderators:	Ms. Saundra Bishop	Project Coordinator, Parent/Community Council (Friday)
	Ms. Letha Coleman	Chicago Urban League (Saturday)
Participants:	Ms. Bobby Cobb	Co-Chairperson, Mayor's Summit Parent/Community Council
	Ms. Janice Metzger	Co-Chairperson, Mayor's Summit Parent/Community Council
	Ms. Valerie Shahariw Kuehne	School of Education and Social Policy, Northwestern University

Dr. Julius Menacker

Professor, College of Education
University of Illinois (Chicago)

Panel 2: School-based management

Moderators: Ms. Martha Jantho

Special Assistant to Chancellor
City Colleges of Chicago
(Friday)

Ms. Anna Smith

Member, Chicago Urban League
Education Advisory Committee
(Saturday)

Participants: D. Gerald O. Dreyfus

Assistant Superintendent
Board of Education, Miami, Florida

Dr. Frank Gardner

President, Chicago Board of
Education

Mr. Luther Washington

Assistant Director, Special Education
Hammond, Indiana

Dr. Gary Phillips

Consultant, National School
Improvement, Seattle, Washington

Panel 3: The principal's roles and responsibilities

Moderator: Mr. Bernard Spillman

Principal, Westinghouse Vocational
High School

Participants: Ms. Dyanne Dandridge-
Alexander

Principal, Herbert Spencer
Elementary School

Ms. Lucy Matos

Director, Central Park Elementary
School, New York City

Mr. Walter Parker

Principal, Kenwood Academy
High School

Mr. Bob McCarthy

Coalition for Essential Schools
Providence, Rhode Island

Mr. James Deanes

Chairman, Mayor's Summit Parent/
Community Council

Panel 4: Teacher professionalism: roles and responsibilities

Moderators: Mr. Ted Oppenheimer

Executive Director
Citizen Schools Committee

	Mr. William McKersie	Program Officer, Joyce Foundation
Participants:	Mr. John Kotsakis	Assistant to the President Chicago Teachers Union
	Dr. Judy Johnston	Director, Schenley High School Teacher Center, Pittsburg
	Mr. Paul Francis	Vice President, Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers
	Mr. William D. Geer	Executive Director, Foundation for Excellence in Teaching

Panel 5: Curriculum and instruction for inner-city students

Moderator:	Dr. Nelvia Brady	Staff Associate, Chicago Community Trust
Participants:	Dr. Geraldine Brownlee	Assistant Professor, University of Illinois - Chicago
	Dr. Adrienne Bailey	Vice President Academic Affairs National College Board (Saturday)
	Dr. Ruben Carriedo	Assistant Superintendent San Diego Public Schools (Friday p.m. and Saturday)
	Ms. Vivian Wallace	Teacher, Central Park East Elementary School, New York
	Dr. Alma Jones	Principal, Carver Elementary (Friday)

Panel 6: Community control decentralization models

Moderator:	Ms. Gwen Jordan	Associate Director Community Renewal Society
Participants:	Dr. Allan C. Ornstein	Professor, School of Education Loyola University
	Dr. Norman Fruchter	Professor Education, City University of New York, Brooklyn, New York
	Dr. Jerome Harris	Superintendent, District 13 New York City Public Schools

Mr. Leon Finney

Executive Director
The Woodlawn Organization

Mr. Carlos Heredia

Director, Por Un Barrio Mejor

Panel 7: Budgeting and finance reform

Moderators:

Ms. Diane Lauber

Assistant Director, Chicago Panel
on Public School Policy and Finances
(Friday)

Dr. G. Alfred Hess, Jr.

Executive Director, Chicago Panel on
Public School Policy and Finances
(Saturday)

Participants:

Ms. Barbara Peck

Chief Financial Officer
Chicago Board of Education

Dr. Roland Bowers

Associate Superintendent, Tulsa,
Oklahoma Public Schools

Dr. James Ward

Professor, University of Illinois-
Champaign Urbana

Panel 8: Central administration roles and responsibilities

Moderator:

Mr. Primus Mootry

Executive Director, Better Boys
Foundation

Participants:

Mr. Pat Keleher

Director of Public Policy, Chicago
United, Inc.

Dr. Laval S. Wilson

Superintendent, Boston
Public Schools

Ms. Jean Oden

Mayor's Summit Parent/Community
Council

Dr. Thomas Knarr

Assistant Superintendent, Hammond,
Indiana Public Schools (Saturday)

Panel 1: Parents' Role/Parental Involvement

A key issue in discussing this issue is the definition of parent involvement. It is often assumed that parent involvement is understood to be one thing by all, and that it has been shown to have positive outcomes in terms of student achievement. Before any suggestions are made about what the parent role and responsibility in the schools should be, there must be a clear distinction in the types of parent involvement, and the expected outcomes for each type.

Four models of school-parent involvement were discussed at the conference:

1. The first model, Home Learning, was emphasized by the panel participants and has received the most attention by educational researchers. In this model, parents act as partners with the school by assisting their child's learning and cognitive development in the home.
2. The second model, Parent-School Interaction, was the focus of parental concerns at the educational conference. The Parent-School Interaction Model involves establishing a supportive relationship between the parents and school personnel, particularly teachers.
3. The third model, Parental Involvement in School Governance, emerged as a major reform in the late 1960's and early 1970's and is also a popular idea in the current debate over reforming the Chicago Public Schools. Under this type of system, parents are given a role in the school's decision-making process on substantive policy issues.
4. The fourth model is the Summit proposal for parent education and development institutes and expansion of the Local School Bodies (LSB's). The focus of the parent education and development institute would be training in school governance and support of personal development to individuals. Curriculum would also include instruction in educational foundations, school curriculum, urban sociology, social problems, research, test and measurements, multi-cultural education, and community organization (*Cobb, Conference remarks*). Funding and support would come from universities, colleges, community agencies and businesses. Parents and community members would have the opportunity to act as "peer trainers."

Model 1: Home Learning. The Home Learning Model denotes school programs which facilitate parental involvement or encouragement in learning activities with the

child in the home environment. Such activities may include reading to the child, supervising homework and attendance, playing structured learning games, offering incentives for good academic performance, supplying learning resources in the home, and providing adequate time and space in the home for the child to study or prepare for school. Teachers or school personnel typically help the parents by providing information, materials, or training designed to enable the parent to promote the child's learning abilities.

An example of a program fitting the Home Learning Model is described by Moles (1987) and Davies (1987). The Parents in Touch Program serves the elementary school children of Indianapolis, Indiana. A large component of the program stresses the provision of workshops, training, and resource materials to parents for their use in home learning activities with their child. Parents are encouraged to work with their children for 15 to 30 minutes each day. Teachers provide the materials and training for the parents.

A second example is a program conducted at a Chicago elementary school from 1975-1976 (Walberg, Bole, & Waxman, 1980). Eight hundred and twenty-six predominantly low-income, black students and their parents signed contracts designed to improve the students' academic performance. The students promised to work on their school performance while the parents pledged the following: (1) to provide appropriate nutrition, clothing, and work space for the child; (2) to offer verbal support to the child regarding his/her academic progress and self-esteem; and (3) to assist the teacher in efforts to improve the child's school work, behavior, and attendance in class. These home learning techniques were found to have significant effects on the students' scores on the Iowa Basic Skills Test, especially for those classes where teachers encouraged intensive parental involvement in home learning.

Most research on parent involvement in home learning activities has found similar improvement in student achievement and prosocial behaviors (Hawley, *et al.*, 1984). In a brief review of the literature in this area, Henderson (1988) states that "low-income, low achievers whose parents are counseled in positive home teaching techniques make significant, lasting gains in intelligence" (p. 61).

Model 2: Parent-School Interaction. The Parent-School Interaction Model covers programs that seek to foster a positive relationship and understanding between parents and the school by promoting parent involvement in school-related activities. Examples

include parents working in paid or volunteer positions at the school, parent participation in parent-teacher organizations, and parent attendance at parent/teacher conferences, fundraisers, or other organized school functions. In general, these activities are initiated by the schools and occur on the school's terms.

The research into the impact of the Parent-School Interaction Model on student achievement finds a moderate, positive correlation. Henderson (1988) reports that "graduates of Head Start and Follow-Through programs in which the level of parent involvement is high do better throughout their entire school careers" (p. 60). Hawley *et al.* (1984), in a literature review, conclude that a weak relationship exists between this type of parent involvement and student achievement or school effectiveness.

The research in this area, though limited, provides evidence in favor of the beneficial effects of parent participation in school-related activities on student achievement. This model promotes change in teacher behavior through greater availability and openness to parents. It also fosters increased parental contact with the school. However, this encouragement of greater parent-school interaction does not change the fundamental relationship between parents and school personnel. Teachers and administrators retain their full authority over the school and the classroom.

Model 3: Parental Involvement in School Governance. One of the first demonstrations of this model occurred in New York City during the late 1960's. As described by Ravitch (1972), a pilot project in community control was started in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville school district. Under this plan, a governing board was elected from the local parent community. The seven elected parent representatives then chose five community representatives. This board had the power to hire administrators, staff, and principals, decide financial issues, and design policies regarding curriculum, program development and personnel practices. The project lasted three years.

A second example of the Parent Involvement in School Governance model was initiated in the New Haven Public Schools by professionals from the Yale Child Study Center (Comer, 1980). In New Haven, the Yale group created school management teams consisting of parents, teachers and staff under the guidance of the school principal. While this arrangement afforded less parental control than the Ocean Hill-Brownsville project, New Haven parents actively participated in decision-making on issues of school climate, academics, and staff development (Comer, 1980).

The experience of New York City and Detroit under mandated decentralization

represents a third way to implement this model. In both cities, legislation created smaller school districts with local school boards or councils empowered to advise the district on school policy. The actual power of the parents under these systems in Detroit and New York is still the subject of debate.

The research on this model has produced mixed findings on the impact of parent involvement in school governance on student achievement. Researchers who cite positive results include Rogers and Chung (1983). In their study of the New York decentralization experience, they found yearly improvement in city-wide reading scores between 1971 and 1981 as evidence of the positive effect of this model. Cone, Delawyer and Wolfe (1985) examined 229 children with special education needs and their parents to assess the effect of parent involvement. They suggest that parental participation in program administration was related to student achievement. Comer (1980) discovered that the management team approach used in the New Haven public schools (described elsewhere) dramatically improved the reading and mathematics scores of the students and the attendance records of the teachers. Additional support is offered by Daresh (1986) who states that when people with a vested interest, such as parents, are included in the decision-making process, school practices and programs are improved.

In the opposite camp are researchers such as Ravitch (1972) who found that community control at Ocean-Hill Brownsville did not improve the academic performance of the students. One year after the project ended, the reading scores were lower than the scores taken before the start of the project. Other research on the effect of decentralization in New York and Detroit reveals little to no change in student achievement (LaNoue & Smith, 1973; Ornstein, 1973). As a result of such findings, Goldbloom (1973) concludes that community control of schools benefits the economic elite while providing only a semblance of power to the poor community.

Model 4: Parent Institutes and Expanded Local School Bodies. In general, research supports the fact that parent education has a positive effect on student achievement (e.g., Pelkey, 1977; Uhl, 1975). This research thus also supports the assumption that focusing on parent education is beneficial to the cognitive and social development of children.

However, some cautions are in order as far as parent education goes. What does not seem to be recognized, or was not made explicit in the discussion of these institutes, is

that a number of assumptions are running through parent education: that there is a "right way" to be a parent, that the "right way" can be taught and will be used successfully by parents, and that the barrier to parents not getting involved in schools is that parents do not possess the knowledge and skills to do so (Gordon, 1977). Who chooses the curriculum for these institutes and who does the training are important issues for these institutes, and the current suggested curriculum implies that there is a value system that makes sense and is relevant to all parents. There is also the discrepancy between parents being both learners and decision-makers in the system. Does one supersede the other, or can a parent be in an active decision-making role while going through parent education classes? A great deal of thought will have to be given as to how the "unskilled" parents fit into the system in order to ensure equal distribution of power among parents.

The idea that "parents are resources worthy of investment" was one stressed particularly with regard to parents of lower socioeconomic status. "We must utilize the wealth of indigenous talent in our parents..." (*Bishop, Conference remarks*) was a commonly agreed upon theme of the conference. This suggestion has also been made in many articles on parent involvement, yet few programs have implemented or utilized what parents already know into parent involvement programs. The parent development institutes do not make clear how they plan to utilize the "indigenous talent" of the parents in Chicago.

If institutes are going to be any kind of solution, research can aid policy makers in how the institutes may be the most successful (Wallat & Goldman, 1979). For one, the program should provide parents with plenty of role models and plenty of time to practice any new roles that they learn. Secondly, self evaluation is a key component--parents need time to reflect on new skills and roles and need to evaluate their progress and recognize what their future goals are. Finally, parents need to have a voice in how the program is shaped; an opportunity to express opinions on all components of any program is very important to how successful the program is.

The Summit proposal for parent education and development institutes could have positive effects if approached and carried out in the right way. The currently planned institutes sound extremely comprehensive, but they might have a better chance of success if they focus on a few areas rather than trying to do everything for parents.

Local School Bodies (LSBs) are committees designed to ensure input from the community and parents on school policies. One model proposes that six parents, two

teachers, two community members, and one principal will compose the committee for each school. The local school body will develop the design for training in the institutes, as well as create plans for "meaningful parent/community support of the instructional program" (both in the academic and the social/recreational sense) and for carrying the school program into the homes of the students (Summit, 1988). The parents on the LSBs will be selected by vote. Others parents may provide input to the LSBs.

With regard to the LSBs, and for the issue of parent involvement in general, a number of assumptions exist. These are: that linking home and school environments will result in positive outcomes, that parents are "resources worthy of investment," that the family as opposed to the school is where the child primarily learns his/her values and behaviors, and that the parent/child relationship is more important than the teacher/child or peer relationship (*Kuehne, Conference remarks*).

Research does, overall, support the assumption that there are positive benefits to linking the home and school environments through parent involvement. However, what is often not mentioned in the literature, and what was not mentioned at the conference, are the possible negative effects of parent involvement. Particularly in the cases of parent education and LSBs, if a parent enters into the role of decision-making and no results come from his/her actions, or if a parent is pushed into interacting with his/her child in ways that are not properly taught or supported, negative effects may result in the form of lowered feelings of self-efficacy and self-esteem.

Panel 2: School-Based Management

The basic tenet of school-based management is to localize power and decision-making authority. The theory of local management assumes that when people are involved in making decisions, they have more ownership and commitment to the outcome. Conference panelist Gary Phillips argued that people who have a stake in policies and decisions are in the best position to influence them. The school thus becomes more responsive to the needs of its students when it has input from all facets of the community, which also has a very real stake in the success of the public school system.

According to most school-based management models, parents and educators each play a crucial role in the school management process. The concept of "Parents as Partners" was coined by Project ACCESS, a joint effort of Citizens Education Center Northwest and the Seattle School District. According to one ACCESS document: "It is easy for school improvement to get entangled in issues of compensation, centralized management and employee relations. Parents balance the scale toward academic achievement above all other concerns."

Project ACCESS, funded by the Ford Foundation from 1981 to 1985, found that the costs associated with increasing parents' involvement in local school management programs can be minimal. The Project gave nine pilot schools \$1,000 each to assist them in promoting parental involvement. Each local parent group was given authority over the use of the money, giving the previously "shut-out" parents a feeling of power. Money was spent on on-premises child care, which was utilized during meetings and functions held at the school. This encouraged parents with young children to participate in school government, which they might not be able to do if they had to pay for babysitting. Grants were also used to pay parking expenses of parents during school functions, and also for hosted lunches or dinners. By picking up the cost of these special meals, the parent groups provided an incentive for parents to attend meetings and made them feel appreciated.

The communities served by project ACCESS contained many active parent participants in school-based management who were either homemakers or professionals with flexible job schedules. The Project felt it was "critically important" to get the input of less fortunate parents. In many cases, it is the children from such homes that often have

the hardest time succeeding in school. In order to attract these parents, the Project recommended:

1. Inform parents that the meetings will address their concerns.
2. Hold meetings in places familiar to them, such as neighborhood centers and churches, in order to increase the parents' comfort.
3. Send personal invitations to the parents and follow up with a phone call.
4. Make sure parents are adequately trained for school-based management and not just dropped into the middle of the program. The Project wants parents informed about the educational history of the school and district, and about key people (politicians, school administrators, etc.) that they would be interacting with on a regular basis.

Project ACCESS recommends that parents be trained along with school faculty to fully integrate parents into the local management process. The Project also found that the concerns and positions of parents on local school councils is strengthened when they are backed and supported by a core group from the wider parent community.

Power in a school-based management system must not be usurped by district or central school administrations. Individual schools are responsible for their own budgets, hiring and firing of staff, curriculum selection and other issues critical to the school. Citizens Education Center Northwest has discovered that "schools are most cost-effective when persons responsible for the educational program in a school plan staffing patterns and use of materials."

Another conference panelist, Gerald Dreyfus, Assistant Superintendent of School-Based Management in Miami, Florida's Dade County, described his system's recent implementation of local school rule and its flexibility that gives individual schools authentic decision-making power.

Dade County's school system educates almost 255,000 students and is the nation's fourth largest, behind New York, Los Angeles and Chicago, and is growing at the rate of 15,000 new students each year. In 1986, a pilot school-based management program was approved by the Dade County School Board, and was implemented in 32 of the county's 259 schools. As a way of assuring them control of their schools, local school councils could petition for "waivers," which, if approved, would allow them to deviate from prescribed rules and, in the case of a creative school, would allow them to petition for funds for special projects devised by local councils.

Dreyfus explained at the conference how creative schools in this county had tailored their financial expenditures to directly meet the needs of their students. In Dade County, schools are given lump sum amounts from the county and are allowed to use these funds however the local school government deems appropriate, as long as county-wide rules are followed. Teacher salaries, supplies and funds for equipment are included in this lump sum. Even though teachers are under contract for specific salaries, a school can establish additional incentives for teachers through union waivers. For instance, "master teachers," who act as mentors to newer teachers, and part-time specialists are hired by some Dade County schools. Not only does this provide extra money to these staff and adjunct faculty members, but the process also establishes career ladders for teachers and enables them to enjoy greater professionalism as they are financially rewarded for achievement.

Panel 3: The Principal's Roles and Responsibilities

Purvey and Smith (1983) list seven generally agreed-upon traits of effective inner-city schools:

1. Strong leadership by the principal.
2. High staff expectations for student achievement.
3. A clear set of goals for school.
4. Emphasis on order and discipline.
5. Instructional emphasis on basic skills.
6. Systems for monitoring of students' progress.
7. Effective school-wide training program for staff.

One way to summarize the conference proceedings on the topic of the principal's role is to ask: To what extent is a principal in the Chicago Public Schools in a position to influence these school characteristics? To what extent can he or she be in such a position?

Trait 1. Strong leadership by the principal. A difficulty that comes with focusing on the principal as a primary agent for reform, is the notion that a perfect principal profile exists. Different schools face different crises, and different individuals often need to deal with those crises. This issue has special salience for the urban crisis. Many of the principals lauded in the press, such as Joe Clark, are hailed for bringing order and discipline into a chaotic school. These principals are praised for their ability to be capable managers.

However, the research on effective schools tends to show that the ideal principal is an instructional leader who is able to raise student achievement. It may not be possible to expect principals to be both effective managers in crisis-ridden schools and instructional leaders.

Instructional leaders are often characterized by a democratic form of leadership, which emphasizes student achievement and teacher training.

Look and Manatt (1984) state that principals as instructional leaders should exhibit certain qualities. They should: emphasize achievement, set instructional strategies, provide an orderly atmosphere, frequently evaluate student progress, coordinate instructional programs, and support teachers.

Chubb (1988) studied the organization of high-achievement schools versus low-achievement schools. He found that schools at the top have strikingly superior organizations, which exhibit different goals from those at the bottom, placing more emphasis on academic excellence as opposed to "the basics." Principals in the top schools are less likely to have accepted the job to escape teaching, and see the job less as a stepping stone to a higher administrative office. Their leadership is more pedagogical and less managerial than in low-performance schools. Sound principal leadership delegates authority to the classroom. This may explain why these principals were more successful in gaining their teachers' confidence. These principals ran their school organization much more like a team than a hierarchy.

Bob McCarthy from the Coalition for Essential Schools spoke at the conference about the importance of a unified organization. Decisions about curriculum and pedagogy should be placed on teachers and the principal. The principal must be able to move decision-making to the teachers, and be given resources to make it happen. The principal must have autonomy, but also share leadership with teachers. McCarthy emphasized also that the top-down approach to reform must be rejected.

Traits 2-4. High staff expectations. Clear goals. Emphasis on order. These are areas where the principal alone cannot directly influence achievement. All three require the cooperation and commitment of staff at all levels of the school organization. A principal may have high expectations for student achievement, and may communicate them to his/her staff, even quite effectively, but if they do not share that view, the goal will not be accomplished. A similar situation exists with goal-setting--all must share the goals; and with order and discipline, the party line must be consistent and consistently enforced.

What, then, are the principal's tools for gaining the cooperation and commitment of staff in these areas? First, when there is an opportunity, the principal can select individuals who are likely to agree on school priorities. With existing staff, the principal possesses three tools: incentives, sanctions and moral suasion--an ability to convince them of the rightness of his ideas.

In other words, in order to create an environment for student achievement, an important aspect of the principal's job is to build a team. As Wortman says, the principal's job is to be "an orchestra leader...you can image how bad it sounds when everyone is playing a different tune" (Wortman, 1988). In Chicago the only

team-building tool available to the principal is moral suasion. It is an exceptionally talented leader who can make that tool work without the others.

One of the themes that came up repeatedly at the conference and in interviews with principals was the fact that they do not have control over the hiring, retention, or firing of teachers. Hiring and assignment of teachers is a central office function (Crandall, 1988). Factors such as seniority and compliance with racial goals in the 1983 consent decree heavily influence assignment. Principals are, for the most part, told who will be teaching in the building for which they have responsibility.

There are some exceptions. Magnet school principals have considerable flexibility when the school staff is initially assembled, and some flexibility with regard to advertising and interviewing candidates for vacancies. Principals at "options" schools are able to advertise and interview for positions in certain subject areas. Finally, a principal who is "aggressive" and very committed to building a good staff can try to work the system to his advantage. For example when a teacher wants to transfer to a principal's school the principal can observe that teacher at the current school. Since the principal may have difficulty getting an honest appraisal from the current principal it may be necessary to "dig around" to check the person out. If it is determined, from the limited information available, that the teacher is not wanted, the principal either has to make a very good case for why the person is unsuitable, or persuade the teacher to withdraw the request to transfer (Wortman, 1988). Most principals don't bother--if a teacher is at the top of the transfer list, they take him/her.

A final sad comment on the difficult task of assembling a "team" is the fact that a principal cannot always keep good teachers once they are assigned. Teachers assigned on a "full-time substitute" basis can be bumped if someone gets permanent certification and is assigned to that position (Clark, 1983).

It is extremely difficult to fire a teacher from the Chicago public school system, and it is almost as difficult to transfer a teacher to a different school. Magnet schools and options schools have no real advantage in this area.

The consensus among principals on the system for evaluation, remediation, and removal of incompetent teachers in the 1985 School Reform Act, is that it is cumbersome, very time-consuming, and that there are too many loopholes (Chicago Tribune, 1988). One principal reported that when he assumed his position, past personnel records on the existing staff were "missing." Even when one is willing to

exert the effort to initiate the removal process, it is difficult to document what constitutes grounds for removal (Wortman, 1988).

A principal can only "weed out" teachers who are not team players from his staff by transferring them to another school. Cuban (1984) refers to this moving about of marginal and incompetent teachers as "the dance of the lemons." A principal who wants to make the effort to orchestrate the "dance" to his advantage, and prevent it from working to his disadvantage, must again be committed and aggressive. Even then, compromises are made at the district level (Clark, 1983), and presumably no principal is immune from the politics involved.

As for incentives, the last of the principal's possible tools for building a team, the current situation leaves principals empty-handed. Financial rewards are governed entirely by a collective bargaining process, which yields a salary structure that has no rewards for merit. As for other possible rewards such as staff development opportunities, principals have very little discretion over very little money.

It is frequently pointed out by principals that they do not have administrative control over the custodial or lunchroom staff. Although these individuals are clearly not as critical to the effort as the teachers, if they refuse to be part of the team and the principal is impotent with regard to their behavior and attitude, the students know it, the teachers know it, and the best of efforts can be undermined.

Traits 5-7. Basic skills emphasis. Monitoring students' progress. Staff training. Each of these areas require the cooperation and support from the central administration through resources for principals, or the autonomy and resources to accomplish these goals on their own.

Currently in Chicago, curriculum is determined by "experts" in the central administration. Although the current emphasis may be on basic skills, principals feel that they and their teachers have little input and that recent changes have been "forced" upon them (*Dandridge-Alexander, Conference remarks*).

Systems for monitoring student progress are also developed centrally and the principals and their teachers feel little "ownership" for them. Rather than viewing them as tools they can use to improve their school's effectiveness, they see them as a "stick" that central office can hold over them (*Dandridge-Alexander, Conference remarks*).

Principals have a related complaint over training for staff. When new curriculum and testing is imposed from above, the training supplied by the central office is

inadequate. The principals also do not control funds at the local school level that could supply training in these or other areas.

Several reform proposals are ambiguous in providing principals with the tools they need to make their schools effective. An example of this ambiguity (although not the only one) is the Summit proposal regarding staff selection. Although Panelist James Deanes, Parent/Community Council Chairman, insisted at the conference that principals would be able to hire and fire staff, there was considerable doubt among the principals present, based on their reading of the Summit language. One section that addresses the subject states that the principal will have "final decision-making power for hiring and firing teachers, within system-wide personnel policies, due process and existing laws." Another section also refers to system-wide guidelines and adds that the Local School Body will be able to have input by developing criteria for staff selection that would be in addition to system-wide criteria.

Nowhere in the Summit document is it stated what the system-wide criteria will be, who will be responsible for developing them, or what the constraints on them are likely to be. Any reference to the role of the union contract, or the consent decree, is entirely avoided. Unless both of these statements can be modified in significant ways, the "promise" of control over hiring and firing is meaningless.

When it is stated that the principal shall have "legal authority over the entire school, both building and staff," there is no specificity regarding the term "staff." Mr. Deanes argued at the conference that the intent was to cover custodial and lunchroom staff, but the principals present felt that was not clear. As for evaluating and removing staff, the Summit document makes several references to a temporary acceptance of the current teacher remediation plan, but commits to working with the "Board/Union Committee" to assess its effectiveness. No mention is made of the fact that the process is also mandated in the 1985 reform legislation.

For the creation of systems for monitoring student performance, the Summit calls for the establishment of a system-wide curriculum referenced assessment system. It recommends that "decision-makers" at the school, district and system-wide levels receive profiles of student performance.

Finally, in the area of staff development, the principal is given the responsibility for developing staff development plans, but no mention is made of resources to do it.

According to the section of the Rules of the Board of Education entitled Duties of Principals, "Principals of schools are the responsible administrative heads of their respective schools and are charged with the organization, supervision, administration, and discipline thereof. They shall establish and enforce such regulations, not contrary to the rules of the Board of Education or the regulations of the General Superintendent of Schools, as in their judgment may be necessary for the successful conduct of their schools" (Board of Education, 1987).

At the conference, panelist Walter Parker, the principal of Kenwood Academy, read from that section and then said "we all know a thousand other things go along with that." He then listed five of those things: "The kind of instruction in our schools, very limited responsibility for staff selection, staff development, staff evaluation, and resource management." He later went on to say that there are a number of things that principals are currently responsible for that ought to be someone else's responsibility. He mentioned registering students to vote. A member of the audience, apparently also a principal, added to that, mentioning responsibility for checking health records and following up on truancy cases.

The tendency of current school reform proposals appears to be to add further to the list of principals' responsibilities. For example, under the Summit proposal, the principal will:

1. develop incentive programs for school staff and encourage participation in system-wide incentive programs;
2. develop and secure substantive professional and resource support for school programs from business and the community;
3. develop staff development plans for all staff (professional and personal growth and development) and will emphasize continuous professional development through various educational efforts, career ladder, and other incentives;
4. work with teachers and parents to expand the core curricula to meet the unique needs of his/her school and establishing programs;
5. cooperate with the Local School Body in the development and implementation of parent training; and,
6. keep the school building open on evenings and on weekends as determined by the Local School Body.

The above are just the responsibilities and duties that the Summit assigns specifically to the principal. In addition there are, particularly in the section on improving student performance, a number of system-wide objectives. There is nothing in the proposal to indicate that the implementation of these will be the responsibility of anyone other than the principal.

Researchers agree that if principals truly hold a pivotal position to effect positive change in schools, they often do not have the training, resources, or authority to effect such changes. In Chicago, there is no principal center or organized opportunity for professional development as exists in some other places (Barth, 1986).

Panel 4: Teacher Professionalism: Roles and Responsibilities

To be successful, any organization must encourage and motivate those people who are absolutely essential to the functioning of that organization (*Geer, Conference remarks*). Yet in education, teachers are considered to be the lowest "workers" in the hierarchy of a school system (*Kotsakis, Conference remarks*). The professionalization of teaching is a way to address educational reform where education really takes place--in the classroom.

The issue of teacher professionalism encompasses the training and licensing of teachers by members of the same profession. Currently teachers are trained in universities by non-classroom teachers and others, and other than minimal observations and student-teaching, their training is isolated from the practice of teaching. It is the only major profession to separate training from practice (*Geer, Conference remarks*). This in turn leads to the crisis of first-year teachers. The destructive and demeaning experience of first-year teachers sets up a pattern of low self-esteem, status and attitude (Lortie, 1975).

Teaching is also a profession in which all evaluation is done by non-teachers, and members of the teaching profession have no input in the development of teaching standards. Since they are considered subordinates in an organization which is governed by non-teachers, teachers have no influence in the decisions that affect the success of their profession. Teachers have very little control over the circumstances in which they practice their craft or over the standards under which they are evaluated.

Most professions have mechanisms for development and renewal of current members: professional conferences, journals and informal discussions. While teaching has these things, teachers are not supported in the effort to improve and update the practice of their craft. Teaching is the only profession that puts a member in a room with the clients, shuts the door and expects service for 35 years (*Francis, Conference remarks*). This practice is not conducive to the development of quality instruction and, therefore, quality education.

Teachers highly value intrinsic psychological rewards, and these rewards should be tied to the classroom. Teachers cite the ability to "reach" students, students' academic accomplishments, and confidence and recognition of their own ability to help students grow and mature as their most important psychological rewards (Wise and

Darling-Hammond, 1984/5; Lortie, 1975). Feedback and interaction are needed for teachers to perceive that they are being effective as teachers and thus feel that psychological reward. The isolation that teachers experience means that they receive little feedback and that they must improve by trial and error. The feedback that does exist is in the form of evaluation by the principal. There are demonstrated problems with this form of interaction because good teaching means different things to different people, and the principal will evaluate the teacher with his or her own set of beliefs and philosophies about teaching or with a rigid set of established criteria that often includes a neat, tidy and quiet classroom. The most effective schools are those in which teachers are encouraged to participate in professional dialogue and collaboration with their peers and where teachers improve their skills through analysis, evaluation and experimentation with colleagues (Wise and Darling-Hammond, 1984/5). Teachers in these situations are therefore also the most likely to stay in teaching (Ricciotti, 1988).

These are the problems addressed in the teacher professionalization project in Pittsburgh. The focus of the program is an eight-week mini-sabbatical that works on the renewal of existing teachers. It is based on the assumption that teachers, as professionals, know what is best for teachers. The program was designed by teachers, for teachers, and focuses on the skills of peer observation, classroom management and evaluation. This program is successful because it sets up a vision of school reform that the whole district can share. It demonstrated to all teachers and administrators that the district was committed to innovation and flexibility. It also set up a hybrid leadership model in which the principal and the teacher-director worked together and collaborated on the running of a school. At the training center (Schenley High School Teacher's Center) teachers experience the best that teaching can be. It is a school-focused program that developed a new set of roles for teachers, for example, an Instruction Chair, a Resource Clinical Resident Teacher, a Teaching Colleague and a Clinical Resident Teacher. These roles were designed by teachers and were logical designations within the craft of teaching. The school administrators are also part of the new program. The principals and vice-principals are required to make observations of teachers several times a month. The program includes a model of effective instruction, and teachers and administrators alike are required to learn a common vocabulary about effective instruction so that in the evaluation process, the teachers and administrators are

addressing the same set of priorities using a common vocabulary. At Schenley they found that teachers can make a significant contribution to the growth of their peers and that by being observed, teachers feel as though they are an important part of the education process. After all, what gets counted, counts (Johnston, 1985).

Part of professionalism must be the involvement of teachers in the setting of standards for evaluation and in the evaluation process. Standards need to be set by those who know teaching--the teachers (*Francis, Conference remarks*). For this collaboration to be successful, both evaluators and teachers must be involved in the development of standards, priorities and criteria for evaluation. This gives the teacher something to work toward and provides a framework within which any system of evaluation can give effective feedback. At Schenley, administrators are required to do teacher observations regularly and teachers observe each other. This process is the basis for feedback, improvement and evaluation (Johnston, 1985).

If all school districts had a system of evaluation like that described above, merit pay would be a good idea. It would reward people who do a better job as measured by their teaching skill. The existing merit pay systems, however, do not reward teachers for teaching, because they do not measure what it is teachers do. Instead they reward the teacher whom the principal likes best, or who puts on the best show when the principal visits (*Francis, Conference remarks*). Merit pay systems that base pay on student achievement are also not tied to what it is that teachers do. A teacher of emotionally disturbed children will show very poorly by this measure, while a teacher of college-bound students will look very good regardless of the level of skill of either teacher (*Francis, Conference remarks*).

It is clear that teachers must be evaluated and rewarded on some kind of scale, but it must not be by people who have never taught or on measures that are not related to the skill of teaching. Merit pay systems as they exist now foster competition among teachers in a school, but we have seen that it is in a collaborative environment that the improvement of instruction can best be accomplished. Teachers who work in a collaborative environment are more likely to participate in peer interaction and receive the feedback necessary to improve their skills and to perceive themselves as successful and therefore stay in education. Teachers who begin as new teachers in a collaborative environment are less likely to experience a "crisis" and teachers who work in a collaborative setting

are more likely to feel a commitment to their school and be motivated to work toward their success. Any conditions in the school that encourage a competitive environment are going to prohibit the professional exchange that is necessary to train new teachers and keep them, and to keep experienced teachers (Wise and Darling-Hammond, 1984/5).

Panel 5: Curriculum and Instruction for Inner-City Students

This panel presented various, contrasting points of view. Each was well-documented in its claims. Current research is not conclusive on determining which point of view is most applicable to the Chicago situation. Perhaps there is no single answer. We present here the substance of the remarks by the panel presenters along with some of our follow-up analysis.

The panel included Ms. Vivian Wallace, a strong supporter of student-centered curriculum. Ms. Wallace is an instructor at Central Park East School, a public grammar school located in Manhattan's Spanish Harlem. Central Park East was founded on this philosophy of adaptive curricula. Ms. Wallace and a group of like-thinking colleagues were given the opportunity to found a school where this philosophy could be put into practice. In Central Park East, educators are seen not as teachers who have a body of information to impart, but as facilitators who bring to the child knowledge about a topic, a topic which the student himself has chosen. Ms. Wallace and her institution see curriculum as a means to the goal of critical thinking, which they see as being developed in a great variety of settings.

The school has achieved positive results thus far. No students have dropped out and it has spawned three or four similar schools in New York and a secondary school is currently being developed.

However, there is the issue of continuity. Since the school is relatively young, we have no evidence that graduates of Central Park East will perform well on achievement tests. Will they perform well on the standardized tests required for college admissions? Ms. Wallace might answer that they would because they have developed a critical mind. However, when she was posed with these doubts in one of the panel sessions, she struggled to reply and in the end seemed to rely on a "we'll have to wait and see" approach.

At the opposite end of the curricular spectrum there is the San Diego public school system. The panel included Dr. Ruben Carriedo, the Assistant to the Superintendent, with specific responsibilities in the Planning, Research and Evaluation Division. Dr. Carriedo's district has responsibility for 150 schools and 120,000 students, of whom 54% are minority.

The two principal goals that the San Diego system set for itself were student achievement and integration. Dr. Carriedo in one of the panel sessions said:

Student achievement is of primary importance. San Diego has district-wide goals and objectives that are developed by the Board and the Superintendent's cabinet. Each school has to develop very specific goals about what kind of achievement will happen.

To achieve these system-wide goals, San Diego has adopted a core curriculum. Dr. Carriedo pointed out that this was an imprecise term. For San Diego it means that the School Board has adopted a new policy that:

there is a body of knowledge or set of courses that every student should have access to. These courses are in the areas of English, Social Studies, Mathematics, and Science, and the Board wants these courses to be very close to the same set of courses that a student would need to enter a four-year university .

San Diego saw its mission as preparing its students to go on to four-year colleges. Curriculum, then, would be used as a means to that end: in order to graduate from a San Diego high school you must possess the qualifications needed for entry to nearby universities. Continuity of educational content and goals is emphasized.

San Diego's uniformity of goals and means extend to the area of textbooks. The system adopts a single set of textbooks for the entire district. Many groups and levels of participants are involved in choosing the textbook, but once adopted everyone uses it, e.g. every sixth-grade mathematics class is using the same textbook.

This policy has other benefits as well. San Diego's student body is highly mobile. The single textbook policy allows students to transfer from one school to another and integrate more easily because the student uses the identical text as his/her old school.

Dr. Carriedo noted that San Diego is proud that its students as a group score at or above the national norm on the California Test of Basic Skills. They achieve especially well in mathematics, where they are between 18 and 22 percentile points above the norm.

A standardized curriculum appears effective for systems which adopt increasing student achievement as a primary goal. In a study conducted by Grossman, Kist, and Schmidt-Posner (1986) we see how a strong, more uniform, and academically-based curriculum was indirectly arrived at after the state of California ushered in a set of educational reforms, all aimed at bolstering the academic demands of secondary schools.

At this point there appears to exist a gap--the Chicago student body is largely made up of poor, minority students who come from a variety of cultures and environments. How does a large system develop a curriculum which reaches out to this new and changing demography--a curriculum which not only reaches out to them, but then pulls them along, through a challenging course of studies, in order to help those students achieve academic goals which are nationally defined?

Perhaps Dr. Geraldine Brownlee, another conference panelist, had the answer when she spoke about the adaptive instruction method. Dr. Brownlee is an Assistant Professor in the College of Education at the University of Illinois-Chicago. The adaptive instruction approach proposes that the teacher is the vital link between the environment which the child is coming from and the material which has to be taught. Adaptation to the individual student is not built into the curriculum, but rather it is accomplished through the teaching method and, ultimately, through the teacher.

Dr. Brownlee emphasized that all students are individuals and bring their own particular learning problems and assets to the classroom. She added:

There is no inner-city curriculum because there is no monolithic inner-city student. It is our responsibility to understand the individuals in our classrooms no matter where they live. Students from a radius of four blocks can be very different.

Dr. Brownlee has much in common with Ms. Wallace of the Central Park East School. However, rather than suggest an individualized curriculum, adaptive instruction allows a school and even a system to implement a standard, achievement-oriented curriculum which can also, through the teacher, be adapted to the individual child.

Dr. Brownlee would suggest that adaptive instruction be taught at all teaching colleges. Moreover, an emphasis on instruction rather than curriculum (and the two are not mutually exclusive--they should, in Chicago's current situation, be pursued simultaneously) could prove much more cost-effective. An emphasis on instruction would also restore reform focus to the classroom, to what goes on between the teachers and the students.

Panel 6: Community Control Decentralization Models

Professor (and panelist) Allan Ornstein identified and defined the following three kinds of decentralization models:

1. Administrative Decentralization, which breaks up centralized school bureaucracies and streamlines or flattens bureaucratic layers. Any transfer of power involves the shift from a centralized authority to field administrators.
2. Community Participation, wherein community members (or non-educators) participate in school policy-making. However, participation is advisory and not binding. Despite a broadening of the education policy-making process, policy-making authority remains vested within a central school authority.
3. Community Control, which combines increased community input with legally binding policy-making authority. This model involves either the redistribution of school policy-making authority from a centralized authority to community members or the broadening of existing policy-making bodies to include non-educators. In either case, the central authority's power is diluted.

In addition, there is a significant distinction based on the level at which decentralization occurs. School-level decentralization refers to the creation of opportunities for broader participation and/or governance at the school level--such as by Local School Bodies. District-level decentralization refers to change at the district level--such as with elected district councils.

All panelists agreed that there is no conclusive evidence illustrating a relationship between decentralized community control and increased student achievement.

A number of studies suggest a relationship between implementation of a community participation model and increased student achievement. Fruchter and Harris argued that student achievement in their respective districts rose because of the impact of district-level decentralization on school governance in the city. Further, student test scores rose despite the continued flight of non-minority and middle-class students from the New York City public school system.

Our follow-up research on the relationship between decentralization and student achievement suggests the general rule that school-level decentralization models are more likely to improve student achievement than district-level models. Of course, to be effective, any decentralization model requires a clear and substantive rather than a vague

or symbolic re-distribution of power over educational policy.

The panel characterized the decentralization models utilized in various cities. Most panelists maintained that community control had never been implemented in any American city and that where it had been tried, the result was mostly conflictual.

Much of the panel's discussion on this point focused on New York City. Ornstein, Harris, and Fruchter argued that, despite popular rhetoric to the contrary, the New York City public school system was not an example of the community control model. Fruchter felt that the city's school system represented an example of limited administrative decentralization at the district level. Harris argued that community control models did exist but not in New York City. Both Harris and Fruchter agreed that many affluent suburban school districts were examples of an informal community control model.

Zimet (1973) studied New York's decentralization legislation and found that community control was not implemented because the legislation embodied two conflicting systems: administrative decentralization and community control. The two conflicting systems were implemented by the legislature as a necessary compromise. The community control component of the decentralization law was diluted largely due to the attempt to gain a political consensus.

Similar strains are present in the decentralization proposals on the table in Chicago. For example, the Summit proposals enhance the school principal's authority over school policy by granting building principals "...legal authority over the entire school, both building and staff." Increased principal authority over school policy is consistent with many school-level decentralization models. However, the Summit proposals also limit, in very general terms, the principal's authority over the establishment and enforcement of school regulations "to the extent that it does not conflict with the rules and regulations of the Board of Education and the General Superintendent." Furthermore, neither the "entire school" or "staff" are defined by the Summit. Both terms are critical to the interpretation of the section regarding the authority of principals.

A number of reform proposals for Chicago establish Local School Bodies. The Summit proposes an 11-member Local School Body composed of parents, educators, and community members at each school. Increased parental and community participation in and control over education policy issues is a central component of most decentralization models.

However, Summit proposals do not empower the Local School Body with substantive policy-making authority. In essence, the Local School Bodies can: (a) advise principals on textbook selection, (b) supplement the core curriculum established by the Board of Education, and (c) review and approve budgets prepared by the principal within Board of Education guidelines.

Panel 7: Budgeting and Finance Reform

According to estimates from the Chicago Panel on Public School Policy and Finance, reform plans announced recently by the Summit will require over \$350 million in funds. Despite this large increase in required funds, financing is not explicitly mentioned in the reform plan. Financing is referred to in providing funding for class size reduction, and revising special education reimbursement formulas, but specific mechanisms are not addressed.

The Chicago Public Schools share many problems with other urban schools in the U.S. In terms of both sources of revenue and costs associated with a central city population, urban schools face more difficult financial situations than their suburban and rural counterparts. In general, urban schools have lower revenues and higher costs than suburban and rural districts.

In terms of revenues, urban schools raise less funds than other school districts due to several factors. First, urban schools enroll a smaller percentage of the total population of school-age children than suburban and rural schools. Central cities have both high percentages of childless households and high percentages of students enrolled in private and parochial schools.

Second, while urban schools generally have a higher per pupil property value than the state average, city residents have less ability to support schools. Callahan, Wilken and Silberman found that the per pupil property value in 34 major cities exceeded the average for their respective states by 26 percent. Thus, they suggest that urban schools have a basis of supporting public schools which is comparable to suburban and rural areas. However, when the ability to pay taxes for schools is considered, central cities have average personal incomes which are much lower than suburban and rural areas in nine of the 14 largest cities. Differences are especially distinct in older cities of the Northeast and Midwest, such as Chicago, which are surrounded by suburbs. In general, cities tax themselves at a lower rate than suburbs for education.

In the Chicago area, the central city has a lower average personal income than surrounding suburbs, and thus, less ability to pay taxes. In addition, property valuations are lower in Chicago than in the suburbs. Chicago has an equalized assessed valuation per pupil of \$38,390 while the suburban average is \$69,483. Thus, Chicago

requires a tax rate double that of the suburban average to yield an equal amount of revenue.

Finally, a third reason why urban schools raise less funds than other districts is municipal overburden. As a consequence of the density and number of people living there, central cities are called upon to provide a wider and more costly array of services, including fire, police, medical clinics, and transit services. Suburban communities, whose populations are wealthier and generally do not require as extensive levels of service, can often avoid or significantly reduce these expenses by having volunteer services, or providing no services at all. The central city also provides many services which benefit the metropolitan community as a whole, such as museums, airports, and athletic facilities. These facilities are located in the central city more for historic than economic reasons and benefit suburban residents more often than central city residents. Due to these reasons, when the tax rates and expenditures of central cities are compared with state averages, city expenditures per capita on municipal services are often twice as high as the state average. Thus, central cities spend more for municipal services of all kinds, while spending a smaller total share on education. As such, education is one of many services provided by the city. Suburban and rural districts, on the other hand, have a lower overall tax rate, but spend a far greater share of this tax rate on education.

Chicago well exemplifies the concept of municipal overburden. Chicago currently has a total tax rate of \$10.35 per \$100 assessed value, which is one of the highest rates in Cook County. However, education makes up only 20 percent, or \$2.12 of this total. Cook County suburbs, on the other hand, have total tax rates of \$7.88 on average, while education makes up 60 percent of this rate, or \$4.73 on average. As Barbara Peck, Chief Financial Officer for the Chicago Public Schools, pointed out at the panel, Chicago has not raised tax rates for education since 1972, when the last general referendum was passed.

Raising local property taxes is one option available to raise at least a portion of the funds necessary for reforms. Dr. James Ward, a panelist, noted that while central city districts are generally considered difficult places to pass education tax increases, other urban districts have been successful at passing increases. Dade County, for example, passed a \$580 million bond when it carried out reform similar to that occurring in Chicago. A Chicago Tribune poll conducted in late May suggested just that over 50 percent of Chicagoans would support a tax increase for education. However, racial

divisions are apparent when black and white responses are disaggregated. Nearly one-half of Whites responded that they would not support an increase, while over two-thirds of Blacks would. These racial differences are explained by Chicago public school enrollment, which is 60 percent Black, 24 percent Hispanic and only 13 percent White. Thus, most Whites have little incentive to vote for increased taxes, since very few have children in the Chicago public schools. When school enrollment is compared to the composition of voters in Chicago, the feasibility of a local tax increase is even more questionable. Among registered voters, 49 percent are White, 42 percent are Black, and 7 percent are Hispanic. As a result, the feasibility of passing a local tax increase is doubtful.

When the possibility of a tax increase is considered in comparison to the low equalized assessed value of property in Chicago, the limits of a tax increase are apparent. In order for Chicago to equal the suburban property tax revenue average per pupil, city school tax rates would have to more than double, to \$8.36 per \$100 assessed value, which would increase the city's total tax revenue to \$14.93. This rate would leave those least able to pay with the highest tax rate in Cook County. Thus, the feasibility and effectiveness of a property tax increase is limited by the city's ability to pass or pay for a tax increase.

Central city schools generally have less local sources of revenue than suburban and rural districts. When costs are considered, urban schools generally have higher costs than other schools. Sacks, Andrews, and Carnevale found that per pupil expenditures were higher in central city districts than in surrounding areas in 46 of the 70 largest metropolitan areas. These urban districts have higher per pupil expenditures despite advantages in economies of scale due to two reasons: students and administrative costs.

In terms of students, higher costs in urban schools are due to the same reason such schools have lower ability to raise local revenues: the disproportionately high number of poor people living in the central city, compared with middle and upper class people. Thus, disadvantaged students are disproportionately located in central cities along with the high number of poor, requiring additional help and resources. Second, a disproportionately high number of students whose first language is not English are located in central city schools. Third, handicapped students are also disproportionately located in central cities. Students who are physically, mentally or emotionally impaired

attend urban schools for two reasons. First, urban schools were historically the first to provide services for the handicapped, while many suburban districts still do not provide such services. As a result, families who cannot afford private schooling are forced to live in urban districts. Second, evidence suggests that children born in low-income households are more likely to suffer physical or mental handicaps than other children, due to malnutrition or inadequate prenatal care. In the Chicago Public Schools, 39 percent of high school and 78 percent of elementary students are considered economically disadvantaged and are eligible for free or reduced lunch. Over half the public school children from low-income families in the state attend Chicago schools.

Urban schools also have higher expenses related to vandalism, both in terms of protection and repair. In addition, urban schools face higher city prices for both goods and services, and generally must pay higher salaries for teachers and administrators. Urban schools also have higher costs since they provide vocational training to a large percentage of students, which is more expensive than other courses.

Finally, higher costs in urban schools result from the large number of personnel, particularly administrative, necessary to provide support for an urban school population. Due to single-parent families and instability in the home, low-income students are generally more mobile than other students. As a result, urban schools require additional personnel to keep track of student transfers within the district.

The expanding role of the federal government in education funding also has led to an expansion in the size of administration at the local level. Meyer (1987) studied the sources of revenue--federal, state, or local--from four intergovernmental surveys and concluded that federal funding generates higher levels of administrative expenditure than local or state funding. Title and categorical programs, and the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in particular, begun by the federal government during the "War on Poverty" era, have added significantly to the size of school district administrative staffs by bypassing the state level and making funds available directly to school districts. In fact, Meyer concluded that ESEA dollars produce about six times the administrative expenditure that state funds produce, while non-ESEA federal dollars produce twice the effect. In terms of administrative staffing, the differences are even greater. ESEA funds produce about 19 times the administrative staffing that state funds produce, while non-ESEA federal dollars produce about four and one-half times the effect. Thus, the combination of increased structuring and increased fragmentation

associated with federal funds results in great expansion in the administrative burden of local school districts. As a result, federal funding encourages schools to mirror federal complexity in order to pursue greater amounts of federal aid.

In a longitudinal analysis of five states, Freeman, Hannan and Hannaway found similar evidence showing substantial increases in district administrative staff associated with higher levels of federal funds. The proposals, reports, and accounting required by federal title and categorical grants easily add up to hundreds of documents a year.

In the Chicago Public Schools, general consensus exists that administrative expenses can and should be reduced by at least some amount. The view that reductions could occur is shared by even those within the administration (*Peck, Conference remarks*). Administrative expenses in Chicago are significantly larger on a per pupil basis than administrative expenses in other districts in the state (*Ward, Conference remarks*). However, when the Chicago public schools' administrative expenses are compared with those of other urban districts, it is generally consistent with per pupil administrative expenditures in cities such as Detroit, Milwaukee and Cleveland. Nevertheless, exact administrative versus teaching expenses are difficult to compare due to differences in accounting procedure and structural organization. Chicago's administrative budget, for example, includes transportation and food service expenditures that are spent on students at individual schools, resulting in an unrealistic inflation of the size of the central office budget.

Urban schools generally have smaller sources of revenue and larger costs related to educating central city populations than suburban and rural schools districts have educating their constituencies. As a result, school financing which is heavily dependent on local taxes provides unequal opportunity to urban and suburban/rural students. Based on this premise, many scholars have argued that school financing should be based at the state level, rather than the local level. This view was given legal backing in the landmark Serrano decision in California in 1971. The Serrano opinion stated: "The quality of a child's schooling shall not be a function of wealth, other than the wealth of the state as a whole."

The Serrano decision prohibited continued serious inequities in the level of per student expenditures between wealthier and poorer school districts by shifting primary responsibility for education finance to the state level (Chicago Panel on Public School

Policy and Finance, 1985). While the decision was legally binding only in California, it has a significant impact on school finance in many states, including Illinois which enacted school finance reform in the early 1970s under the threat of a similar lawsuit.

This was the case in Illinois when equity school finance reform legislation was passed in 1973 following the Serrano decision. All districts received some increase in state aid, as two provisions were written into the reform to benefit suburban and rural districts. First, a district was provided increased basic state aid if it had a low equalized assessed valuation and a high tax rate, which significantly increased aid to suburban schools. Second, a district was also provided increased state aid if it had a high concentration of students from poverty-stricken families, which significantly increased state aid to Chicago, other urban districts such as East St. Louis and Rockford, and some poor downstate rural districts.

Since 1973, however, panelist Dr. Alfred Hess argues that school finance in Illinois has increasingly drifted farther from equity. In 1978, suburban districts increased their share of state funds by manipulating the poverty impact factors. In 1980, the legislature changed the aid formula further, resulting in further benefit to suburban districts. Finally, in 1981 and 1982, the legislature weakened the poverty impact element of the aid formula. All three shifts benefitted suburban schools at the expense of Chicago. Partially as a result of these shifts, Chicago's state revenues actually fell in inflation-adjusted dollars between 1973 and 1981. Thus, Illinois has, over time, moved increasingly away from equity in state funding.

This trend becomes especially clear when the state distributive aid to Chicago is compared with state distributive aid to a composite New Trier High School/Kenilworth Elementary district, combining two of the wealthiest districts in the state. Hess found that the New Trier/Kenilworth composite district was able to raise state aid over 400 percent between 1972 and 1982, while remaining heavily dependent on local property taxes and significantly increasing local taxes over this same time period. Thus, basic distributive aid to the New Trier/Kenilworth composite rose from \$135,709 to \$745,458 between 1972 and 1982. In fact, Hess found a sharp increase in state aid between 1972 and 1982 in all the suburban high school districts sampled.

Panel 8: Central Administration Roles and Responsibilities

It is ironic that the centralization of most American school systems was brought about a few generations ago by good-government reform efforts aimed at isolating politics and patronage from the public schools. Centralized, unitary systems of governance were implemented to insure across-the-board standards and to remove politics and patronage from the education process. The position of General Superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools was created in 1947 to curtail political pressures and corruption in the school system. Herrick (1971) notes in her work on the social and political history of the Chicago school system:

The scars left on the Chicago school system by the years in which schools resources were diverted from instruction to other uses were deep and permanent...The new superintendent entered a system where the administrative staff he inherited had acceded to political pressures and corruption (p. 287).

The discussion in panel 8 shows that we have come almost full circle. The issue now is decentralization for the purpose of enhancing efficiency and responsiveness. A few major themes dominated the panel discussion. Proponents of decentralization argued that:

1. the efficiency of the central administration would be enhanced by downsizing the central administration;
2. the financial resources of the central administration should be shifted from the central administration to the classroom; and,
3. the Board of Education and school administrators should be held accountable to the public.

Opponents argued that decentralization proposals must have very specific and detailed plans which would involve prioritizing issues and creating "realistic" timetables. Opponents also argued that if reform measures are to be implemented, administrators must be protected from "mob rule" by community groups who seek their own agendas.

Both sides agreed that the way the bureaucracy of the Chicago public school system responds will have a great impact on the success or failure of decentralization.

The central administration of the Chicago Public Schools is bureaucratized, with roughly 3,000 employees serving in either the central or district offices. A study by the Chicago Panel on Public School Policy and Finance notes that the per-student

administrative expense is estimated to be \$334 compared to \$281 elsewhere in Illinois -- "about twenty percent higher in Chicago than in the rest of the state."

The research on central administration roles and responsibilities, and the potential merits of decentralization is limited. It consists primarily of historical, narrative descriptions of what happened in specific school systems and/or personal reflections of past and present administrators.

David Rogers (1968) in research on the role of the central administration in New York City, argues that serious impediments to reform and improvement were caused by the ineffectiveness of the educational bureaucracy. The administration, he argues, failed to deliver educational services and was unable to respond effectively to various demands and needs. He notes that board members and administrators were frequently at odds on reform measures, particularly issues dealing with desegregation. He argues that educational bureaucrats and field administrators obstructed policies adopted by the board, and lays the blame of policy failure at their feet. Because of the power held by these educational professionals, Rogers concludes that education decision-making ought to be shifted from the Board of Education to decentralized community school boards.

Another interesting case in point is the decentralization effort that took place in Chicago in the early 1970s. Based on the recommendation of the management firm of Booz, Allen and Hamilton, the Chicago school system began to experiment with some form of power-sharing. The purpose of the Booz, Allen and Hamilton study was to make recommendations on decentralizing the central administrative structure. What resulted was the shift of power from the central office to three newly created administrative areas headed by area superintendents and a deputy superintendent who would coordinate the three area offices. The school board required that each school have a local council which was granted limited powers. These councils could be "involved in" recruiting new principals for their schools. The councils, however, had no veto power in choosing principals. The reform also created district councils, also with limited powers.

Paul Peterson (1976) argues that the bureaucracy of the Chicago school system undermined whatever limited efforts the district and local school councils could make in reforming the system. He argues that it was the "interests, values, and routines of the school system's administrative staff" that really determined the extent of political decentralization.

Robert Goldman, high school superintendent of the Evanston, Illinois school system, pointed out in the panel discussions that reformers must take into account the size and bureaucratic nature of Chicago. He wondered "how much downgrading can there realistically be" and contended that because of the large nature of the Chicago school system, giving authority to parents and teachers would make the system difficult to manage. Since the Board of Education and the central administration is at the center of policy-making, all efforts toward reform must take into account their powerful influence in the decision-making process. In the reform effort--whether it involves changes in the curriculum, the roles and responsibility of principals or the roles of teachers--all roads, so to speak, lead to, through, and in many cases from the central administration. (Goldman also noted, however, that change in the central administration and the empowerment of parents and teachers "are not mutually exclusive").

The heart of the matter is: to what extent can a bureaucratized central administration be counted on, or be motivated, to implement changes that require sharing responsibilities and power with teachers, parents and community groups. A repeated theme within the literature and the panel discussions is the unwillingness of school administrators to share in the decision-making process with parents and community groups.

There is virtually no research that addresses the impact of the structure of the administrative bureaucracy on student achievement. Pat Keleher, an organizational specialist representing Chicago United, noted in the panel discussion that half the cost of the central administration is driven by educational cost. Keleher noted that what was most "critical" to the central administration is the lack of defined functions within the structure of the central administration. Though we know little about the direct impact that a school system's administrative structure has on student achievement, we can infer that a system's structure does affect the manageability of a school system which may in turn affect the availability of resources, financial and otherwise.

Most of the research on administrative decentralization addresses the jobs and resources that are at stake. In the case of efforts to decentralize the New York City school system, Ornstein (1974) noted that "the underlying nuances are more closely related to race and ideology, politics and economics" (p. 130). Some critics of reform argue that administrative decentralization is merely a battle over retaining or distributing jobs within the educational bureaucracy and appears to be a new form of patronage:

The crux of the matter is largely political power, which group will control the schools and related issues of self interest and group ideology. Indeed the administration of schools is largely political (who makes what decisions) and linked to economic considerations (not only who gets what jobs in the future but who gets what jobs now) (p. 13)

The final issue, explored at some length on the panel, was accountability. The issue was framed by Jean Oden of the Mayor's Summit. She noted the metaphoric relationship of the General Superintendent and other administrators as under contract or, as she put it, "purchased" by the citizens of Chicago and accountable to their demands. Citizens should also be the employers of school board members. By empowering local bodies to have representation on the nomination of board members, school policy would reflect the concerns of the community. Failure to successfully implement policy would result in the termination of board members as well. As it stands now the community has no direct influence over who is chosen to the Board of Education, as general superintendent, as deputy or assistant superintendents, or as principals.

This brings to the fore some direct, unaddressed questions. Who can be held administratively responsible for the failure of students, and how? If administrators are to be accountable to the public, by what standards are they to be evaluated? What happens if performance goals fall short? As Laval Wilson, superintendent of the Boston Public Schools noted, if there is going to be change, the plan must specify in a detailed way "who is going to do what, when, with what amount of money."

Selected Bibliography

- Bard, B., "The Battle for School Jobs: New York's Newest Agony," Phi Delta Kappan, 53: 261-69, 1972.
- Bard, B., "Is Decentralization Working?," Phi Delta Kappan, 54:238-43, 1972.
- Barth, R. S., "Principal Centered Professional Development," Theory Into Practice, 25:3, Summer 1986.
- Becker, H., and J. Epstein, "Parent Involvement: A Survey of Teacher Practices," The Elementary School Journal, 83:85-102, 1972.
- Billings, C., "Community Control of the Schools and the Quest for Power," Phi Delta Kappan, 53:553-58, 1972.
- Bloom, B., "The New Direction in Educational Research: Alterable Variables," Phi Delta Kappan, 65:382-385, 1984.
- Brown, F., "Community Control That Succeeded," The Educational Forum, 42:451-7, 1978.
- Chicago Mayor's Education Reform Summit document (revised and approved in substance by the Summit, Chicago), March 21, 1988.
- Chubb, J., "Why the Current Wave of School Reform Will Fail," Public Interest, 90:28-49, 1988.
- Clark, R., Family Life and School Achievement: Why Poor Black Children Succeed or Fail, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983.
- Cohen, D., "The Price of Community Control," Commentary, 48:23-32, 1969.
- Comer, J., School Power: Implications of an Intervention Project, New York: The Free Press, 1980.
- Comer, J., "Parent Participation in the Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, 67:442-6, 1986.
- Cone, J., D. Delawyer, and V. Wolfe, "Assessing Parent Participation: The Parent/Family Involvement Index," Exceptional Children, 51:417-424, 1985.
- Crandall, A. Administrator, Office of the Deputy Superintendent, Chicago Public Schools. Personal communication, 1988.
- Cuban, L., "Transforming the Frog Into a Prince: Effective Schools Research, Policy and Practice at the District Level," Harvard Educational Review, 52:129-151, May 1984.
- Daresh, J., "Effective Home-School Community Relations for Secondary School Improvement," The Clearing House, 59:312-315, 1986.

Davies, D., "Parent Involvement in Public Schools: Opportunities for Administrators," Education and Urban Society, 19:147-163, 1987.

Eliot, T., "Toward an Understanding of Public School Politics," The American Political Science Review, 53:4, 1959.

Epstein, J., "A Question of Merit: Principals' and Parents' Evaluations of Teachers," Educational Researcher, 14:3-10, 1985.

Epstein, J., "Home and School Connections in Schools of the Future: Implications of Research on Parent Involvement," Peabody Journal of Education, 62:18-41, 1985.

Fantini, M., Community Control and the Urban School, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1970.

Fantini, M., M. Gittell, and R. Magat, Community Control and the Urban School, New York: Praeger, 1970.

Fantini, M., and M. Gittell, Decentralization: Achieving Reform, New York: Praeger, 1973.

Gittell, M., Local Control in Education, New York: Praeger, 1972.

Gittell, M., "Critique of the Citizen Participation Movement in Education," Journal of Education, 159:4-22, 1977.

Gittell, M., and A. Hevesi (eds.), The Politics of Urban Education, New York: Praeger, 1969.

Gordon, I., "Parent Education and Parent Involvement: Retrospect and Prospect," Childhood Education, 54:71-79, 1977.

Grossman, P., M. Kirst, and J. Schmidt-Posner, "On the Trail of the Omnibeast: Evaluating Omnibus Education REforms in the 1980's," Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 8:253-266, Fall 1986.

Guttentag, M., "Children in Harlem's Community Controlled Schools," Journal of Social Issues, 28:1-20, 1972.

Hawley, W., S. Rosenholtz, H. Goodstein, and T. Hasselbring, "Good Schools: What Research Says About Improving Student Achievement," Peabody Journal of Education, 61:117-124, 1984.

Henderson, A., "Good News: An Ecologically Balanced Approach to Academic Improvement," Educational Horizons, 66:60-62, 1988.

Herman, J., and J. Yeh, "Some Effects of Parent Involvement in Schools," The Urban Review, 15:11-17, 1983.

Herrick, M., The Chicago Schools: A Social and Political History, Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1971.

Houston, J., and C. Banas, "Active Parents are Key to Many Reform Programs," The Chicago Tribune, May 29, 1988.

Johnston, M., and J. Slotnik, "Parent Participation in the Schools: Are the Benefits Worth the Burdens?," Phi Delta Kappan, 66:430-433, 1985.

Jones, A., Personal communication. Chicago, IL, June 6, 1988.

LaNoue, G., and B. Smith, The Politics of Decentralization, Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1973.

Leler, H., "Parent Education and Involvement in Relation to the Schools and to Parents of School-Aged Children," in R. Haskins and P. Adams (eds.), Parent Education and Public Policy, Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1983.

London, H., "The Meaning of Decentralization," Social Studies, 66:55-9, 1975.

Look, E. and R. Manatt, "Evaluating Principal Performance With Improved Criteria," National Association for Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 71:8-11, November 1983.

Lopate, C., E. Flaxman, E. Bynum, and E. Gordon, "Decentralization and Community Participation in Public Education," Review of Educational Research, 40:135-50, 1970.

Lortie, D., Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Lucas, B., and C. Lusthaus, "The Decisional Participation of Parents in Elementary and Secondary Schools," The High School Journal, 61:211-220, 1978.

McCoy, R. Testimony before the California Senate Education Committee (26 May 1969) in M. Fantini, "Participation, Decentralization, Community Control, and Quality Education," Teachers College Record, 71:1-9, 1969.

McLaughlin, M., and P. Shields, "Involving Low-Income Parents in the Schools: A Role for Policy?" Phi Delta Kappan, 69:156-160, 1987.

Meyer, J., et al., "Centralization, Fragmentation, and School District Complexity," Administrative Science Quarterly, 32:186-201, 1987.

Moles, O., "Who Wants Parent Involvement?," Education and Urban Society, 19:137-145, 1987.

Moore, D., "Selected Research Pertinent to the Panel's Assertion About the Effects of Alternative Governance Structures," Memorandum to the National Advisory Panel on School Reform, March, 1988.

Olmstead, P., and R. Rubin, "Parent Involvement: Perspectives from the Follow Through Experience," in R. Haskins and P. Adams (eds.), Parent Education and Public Policy, Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1983.

Ornstein, A., "Administrative/Community Organization of Metropolitan Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, 54:668-74, 1973.

Ornstein, A., Race and Politics in School/Community Organizations, Pacific Palisades, Ca.: Goodyear Publishing Co., 1974.

Ornstein, A., "Administrative Decentralization and Community Control: Review and Outlook," Urban Review, 15:3-10, 1983.

Pelkey, G., "The Effect of Parent Effectiveness Training and Teacher Effectiveness Training on Student Self-Image," Dissertation Abstracts International, 37:5590A, 1977.

Peterson, P., School Politics Chicago Style, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Pink, W., and D. Wallace, "Creating Effective Urban Elementary Schools: A Case Study of the Implementation of Planned Change," Urban Education, 19:273-315, 1984.

Purvey, S., and M. Smith, "Effective Schools: A Review," The Elementary School Journal, 83:427-452, 1983.

Ravitch, D., "Community Control Revisited," Commentary, 53:71-2, 1972.

Rich, D., Teachers and Parents: An Adult to Adult Approach, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1987.

Rich, D., "Bridging the Parent Gap in Education Reform," Educational Horizons, 66:90-92, 1988.

Ricciotti, J., "Good Teaching: The Goose Bump Response," Principal, 67:41-43, March 1988.

Rogers, D., "School Decentralization: It Works," Social Policy, 12:13-23, 1982.

Rogers, D., and N. Chung, 110 Livingston Street Revisited, New York, NY: University Press, 1983.

Schiff, M., "Community Control of Inner-City Schools and Educational Achievement," Urban Education, 10:415-28, 1976.

Scott-Jones, D., "Families as Educators: The Transition from Informal to Formal School Learning," Educational Horizons, 66:66-69, 1988.

Slaughter, D., and Kuehne, V., "Improving Black Education: Perspectives on Parental Involvement," Urban League Review, 11(1,2):59-75, Summer/Winter, 1987-88.

Uhl, S., "The Effects of Tape Assisted Parent Education Discussions on Fifth Grade Children's Self-Esteem and Achievement Levels," Dissertation Abstracts International, 36:2113A-2114A, 1975.

Wagenaar, T., "Schools Structural Composition and Achievement: An Empirical Assessment," Sociology and Social Research, 62:608-625, 1978.

Walberg, H., "Families as Partners in Educational Productivity," Phi Delta Kappan, 65:397-400, 1984.

Walberg, H., R. Bole, and H. Waxman, "School-Based Family Socialization and Reading Achievement in the Inner City," Psychology in the Schools, 17:509-514, 1980.

Wallat, C., and R. Goldman, Home/School/Community Interaction: What We Know and Why We Don't Know More, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1979.

Wilson, S., "Strengthening Connections Between Schools and Communities: A Method of Improving Urban Schools," Urban Education, 18:152-77, 1983.

Windle, J.L., "Parent Participation in Selected Early Childhood Education Programs in Los Angeles County in 1975-1976 as Perceived by Principals and Staff," Dissertation Abstracts International, 38:4507A-4508A, 1978.

Wise, A., and L. Darling-Hammond, "Teacher Evaluation and Teacher Professionalism," Educational Leadership, 42:28-33, December 1984/January 1985.

Wissler, D., and F. Ortiz, "The Decentralization Process of School Systems," Urban Education, 21:280-94, 1986.

Wortman, R., Principal, Byrne School. Personal communication, 1988.

Zimet, M., Decentralization and School Effectiveness, New York: Teachers College Press, 1973.